



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, begründet von Christian W. M. Grein, fortgesetzt unter Mitwirkung mehrerer Fachgenossen von Richard Paul Wülker. Vierter Band, Erste Hälfte. *König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*. Herausgegeben von Jacob Schipper. Georg H. Wigand's Verlag : Leipzig, 1897.

PROFESSOR WÜLKER and his staff of editors are to be congratulated on the selection of this text for the fourth volume of the *Library of Anglo-Saxon Prose*. For, unlike the miscellany of homilies grouped together in the third volume, the translation of 'Bede' is unquestionably, in many ways, one of the most interesting monuments of Old English prose and one that has not yet received that careful and universal attention it so amply deserves. Still, we cannot greet Schipper's work with unmixed delight. After the appearance of Miller's painstaking edition (E E T S. Nos. 95, 96, 110, 111), with its unusually complete apparatus of various readings, a strictly critical text was of course to be expected. Miller has shown the right way in giving the preference to MS. T. (so far as it is extant); and though he may have been too conservative in introducing emendations, his text certainly comes nearest the archetype. Under these circumstances a full print of such MSS. as O. and B. is rather an unseasonable luxury. It may be found convenient, indeed, for the sake of comparison, to have these representatives of the two MS. groups made readily accessible in parallel columns; but, then, the reproduction of B. (instead of T.) is an obvious anomaly caused merely by Miller's anticipating the long delayed publication of the German scholar.

The plan of Schipper's edition is briefly this. In the left hand column MS. O. is given (the missing portions being supplemented by Ca.), with the various readings from C. and Ca. in foot notes; in the right hand column we find B., together with the variants from T. Preferable readings of other MSS. have been given a place in the text O., the editor tells us, to make it agree as closely as possible with the Latin original. The text B. has been left untouched, wherever '[derselbe] in der vorliegenden Gestalt überhaupt noch einen Sinn gab, der Schreiber desselben ihn also mit Bewusstsein so hingeschrieben haben konnte.' Absolute completeness in recording

minor graphic variations has not been aimed at. The editor vouches for the registering of MS. accents only in the parallel texts themselves, and for the exact distinction of ð and þ only in the texts and the various readings of T. In fact, we find that a more complete picture of the MSS. is, apparently, presented in Miller's edition.

Let us compare a short passage—the first chapter of the third book—in Miller's and in Schipper's edition (Miller pp. 152.5–154.18; Schipper pp. 190–193).

Leaving out of account the numerous cases of scribal abbreviations, erasures, interlineations, etc.—which Schipper evidently did not intend to jot down with scrupulous accuracy, though some of them are decidedly instructive—we find the editors at variance; (1) eleven times, in the matter of accents (Miller 152.7 O.: *Osríc*; 152.9 O.: *tó*; 152.11 B.: *geára*; 152.15 O.: *ófslegen*; 152.16 B.: *wés*; 152.17 O.: *Óno*; 152.23 O.: *ón*; 154.5 O.: *tó*; 154.12 O.: *ís*; 154.13 O.: *óswaldes*; 154.15 O.: *manfullan*; Schipper: *Osríc*, *to*, *þeara*, *ofslezen*, *wes*, *Ono*, *on*, *to*, *is*, *Oswaldes*, *mânfullan*); (2) nine times, in the use of ð and þ (Miller 152.9 B.: *þo*, *ne*; 154.1 T.: *Norþanhymbra*; 154.10 T.: *þa*; 154.11 T.: *þa*; 154.12 T.: *þæs*; 154.13 O.: *ðæs*, T.: *þæs*; 154.14 T.: *broðor*; 154.17 T.: *þære*; Schipper, it must be understood, in most of these cases merely fails to note the deviation of T. from B.); (3) fifteen times, in spelling: Miller 152.9 Ca.: *ðonne*; 152.17 Ca.: *hwæt þe*; 152.20 B.: *deofolgylda*; 152.21 B.: *Hghwæþer*, *ne*; 152.22 Ca.: *hand*; 152.22 B.: *rihtre*; 154.1 Ca.: *adylgode*; 154.6 T.: *geniðrade*; 154.6 O.: *ófslogh*; 154.8 Ca.: *cyrdon*; 154.12 Ca.: *tyledon*; 154.15 Ca.: *getrymmed*, B.: *getrýmede* (i. e., *getrymmede*); 154.16 C.: *ðæm*; 154.17 T.: *ofslog*; Schipper: *Ðanne*, *hwæt ða*, *deofulgylda*, *æþhweþerne*, *hand*, *rihte*, *adyleþade*, *þenyðrade*, *ófsloh*, *cerdon*, *tyledon*, *þetrymmede*, *þetrymede*, *ðam*, *ófsloþh*; (4) in Schipper's omitting a variant of C. 154.1 (Miller: *gear*); (5) in Miller's reading 154.3 T.: *ond heo on gelicnesse* . . ., as over against Schipper's (192.51 f.): **7** *on þelicnesse* . . .

All these discrepancies occur in the space of thirty-eight lines; and under (1) and (2) we have considered differences only within the limits expressly drawn by Schipper.

A number of other passages have been carefully collated, with similar, discouraging results. Only an examination of

the MSS. would enable us to pass a positive judgment on the relative trustworthiness of the two editions; certain cases of disagreement, however, seem to point to misprints in Schipper.

That Schipper's principles of emendation are not always carried through consistently, will be seen from the following examples, which could easily be multiplied.

The scribes of B. can hardly be credited with having put (or left) any sense in passages like the following.

oððe mid *seaftum* awrat (Schipper p. 3, l. 51) (Ca.: stafum).—**7** opra *liczendra* swiðe zetrywra, 4.93 f. (Ca.: lifizendra).—**7** hi him hiran ne woldon, ne woldon rihte eastran healdan on heora tid, *ne eac* maniȝ oðru þinȝ ðære ciricean ānesse hi unȝelice **7** wiðerword hæfdon, 113.171 ff. (for: ȝe eac).—he cōm mid *miclum* werede, ac mid Cristes ȝeleafan zetrymede, 193.74 f. (for: medmiclum).

The text O. demanded a change on p. 55, ll. 1199 ff.: þa þinȝ þa þe ȝe *ȝeseoð* **7** betest ȝelyfdon (read: ȝe soð; Lat. text: ea, quae uos uera et optima credebatis).—p. 56, ll. 1240 ff.: þa onȝunnan hi þ apostolicelif þære *þrymlican* cyricean onhyrizean (T.: frymðelecan; Lat.: primitiuae ecclesiae).—p. 145, l. 877: þa *wende* he swiðe (T.: wonn; Lat.: laborauit multum).—p. 179, ll. 1699 f.: peah ðe an wif wolde mid hyre *nacedum* cilde . . . (T.: nicendum; Lat.: etiam si mulier una cum recens nato paruulo . . .) etc.

Wholly unnecessary is the addition of *he* in B., p. 190, l. 11: he Eadwine; cf. B. 21.350: se ealdorman (Ca.: he se ealdorman); B. 157.1164: Eadwine (the other MSS.: he E.); B. 22.360; 137.702; 148.940; likewise, the insertion of *hy* in B. 118.285.

Why has *caestre* in O. 60.1322 been altered into *ceastre*, whilst it has been allowed to stand 101.2296?

An unhappy emendation by means of contamination is offered in B. 114.188 ff.: Utan biddan ælmihtȝne ȝod, *se ðe eardað* þa anmodan in his fæder rice (B.: . . . se ðe eardað in his fæder rice; T.: . . . se ðe eardiȝan deð þa anmodan in his fæder huse; Lat.: . . . qui habitare facit unanimes in domo (Plummer: domu) patris sui).

We cannot help thinking that if the idea of a critical text was abandoned, a diplomatic print pure and simple without any emendations would have been more serviceable; especially

as the text of the Latin original appears at the foot of the pages. For the latter Schipper was fortunate in having at his service Plummer's recent edition,—a splendid, scholarly book which will no doubt give a new stimulus to the study of the original sources of Anglo-Saxon history.

A final critique of Schipper's work has to be deferred until the completion of the volume. Let us hope that the second part will be ready ere long, and that the Introduction and Notes will not be cut down too rigorously. We also look forward to a statement of the editor's opinion about the authorship of the text.¹ We further wish that it may be possible for the Early English Text Society to have Miller's Glossary to 'Bede' printed in the near future, and for the Oxford Clarendon Press to issue the promised new recension of Alfred's 'Boethius' before the close of this year. In spite of the flood of German dissertations, in spite of the labors of Sweet, Cosijn, Wülffing and others, the study of the Alfredian works cannot yet be said to rest on that broad and safe basis which is due them,—nearly one thousand years after the king's death.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Beiträge zur deutschen Lautlehre von Dr. Wilhelm Horn. Leipzig, 1898. 37 ss. 8°.

Diese kleine Schrift behandelt in eingehender und gründlicher Weise eine Reihe von Fragen der deutschen Lautlehre, wobei der Löwenanteil auf die modernen Dialekte fällt. Der Verf. ist in der Dialektliteratur durchaus bewandert, wie man schon aus einem früheren Aufsätze *Sievers Beiträge* 22, 216 ersehen konnte. Das dort angefangene wird in diesen Bei-

¹ As we are reading the proof, Schipper's monograph *Die Geschichte und der gegenwärtige Stand der Forschung über König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte* reaches us (in 'Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Classe,' Band cxxxviii. Wien, 1898). Professor Schipper expresses himself in favor of Alfred's authorship; he assigns the 'Bede' the first place, in order of time, among the king's translations. In this paper we find a clear confirmation of what we had suspected before, viz., that Schipper has not yet seen the second volume of Miller's edition; it forms the Early English Text Society's issue for 1898, but has been out for more than two years.